



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

PROF. W. BACHER'S "TERMINOLOGIE DER AMORÄER."

Die Bibel- und Traditionsexegetische Terminologie der Amoräer von WILHELM BACHER. (Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1905. Pp. vi + 258, 8vo).

IN 1899 Prof. W. Bacher published, under the title "*Die älteste Terminologie der jüdischen Schriftauslegung*," a dictionary of the technical formulae employed by the Tannaim in their biblical exegesis. With tireless industry he has now added a dictionary of the terminology read by the Amoraim in their exegesis of the Bible and of the traditional literature. To the two parts the author has given the general title, "*Die exegetische Terminologie der jüdischen Traditionsliteratur*." Though the suitability of this title may be questioned, it is quite impossible to propose a better, or to suggest any other even as good. But whatever the title, the student has the fullest satisfaction in possessing from the hand of this profound scholar a reference book designed to render appreciably easier one's understanding of the terminology of the two Talmuds and of the Midrashim. This design Prof. Bacher has executed with masterly skill.

Though the exegetical terminology of the Amoraim has the closest chronological and logical connexion with that of the Tannaim, yet the materials for the two are so various that an independent lexicographical treatment was requisite. The exegetical terminology of the Tannaim deals with the Bible only; it arose in Palestine and is limited to that land, and belongs entirely to the new-Hebrew dialect. On the other hand the terminology of the Amoraim includes the interpretation of tradition besides the exegesis of the Bible; it has its home in Babylonia as well as in Palestine, and employs Aramaic in addition to Hebrew terms and formulae. Hence it comes that the terminology of the Amoraim contains about twice as many items as does that of the Tannaim. This second part includes in its new material more than eighty Hebrew articles, nearly eighty Aramaic terms derived from the Babylonian Talmud, about forty Aramaic terms of both Palestinian and Babylonian derivation; the remainder of the Aramaic terms are translations from the Hebrew vocabulary of

the Tannaite literature. The author has increased the utility of his work by printing in smaller type such terms as are peculiar to the Babylonian Talmud.

This specialized dictionary is written throughout with the most scrupulous care. It is not only fuller and more detailed than are the general lexicons of the Talmud and Midrash, it is also more accurate. There are (in both parts of Prof. Bacher's dictionary) numberless corrections of the readings and explanations to be found in other dictionaries. Three useful indexes (prepared by Dr. Erich Bischoff) collect the references to amended readings, to corrections in the extant lexicons, and to passages in Prof. Bacher's works on the Agada. The additions and corrections to both parts (pp. 248 seq.) are valuable. All the characteristics of Prof. Bacher's work are here present: severe scientific method, absolute conscientiousness, lucidity of exposition, mastery of the subject-matter, industry and thoroughness. The work is, in short, a masterpiece of philological accuracy.

A critic of Prof. Bacher's admirable books can gather but few gleanings. Thus I have only a few insignificant remarks to make, and in no point have I anything to urge which might lessen the unqualified praise enunciated above.—P. 1, l. 6 (from below) it seems to me that in place of **אדרבא מנה** it would be better to read **אדרבא מניה**, as the Talmudical formula also runs **קים ליה בדרבא מניה**.—P. 6 there might have been inserted an article **אליבא** (see also the articles **הלכה** and **תרץ**). The variously explained **אלמא** is possibly derived from **אלא מאי**, and is used in cases where a supposition, refuted by an objection, seemingly can no longer hold, but an opposite assumption obtrudes itself. **אלמא**="but what now?"—P. 8, l. 6, instead of **דלית אפשר דלא מפיק** read **דלית אפשר דלית אפשר דהוא מפיק**, cf. also j. Sanhedr. 20 b, 25 **דלית אפשר דהוא מפיק**. To the article **אמר** must be added the formula **זאת אומרת**, "this implies" (see article **הרא**). To the article **אתא** belongs also the formula **איתא חמי**, j. Demai, 25 b (top); this, however, is cited sub voce **חמי** on p. 66. To the imperative **תא** belongs **חוי**, b. Giṭṭin, 57 a, it is the translation of **וראה**.—P. 21, an article **ביטל לשון אחרון את** should be inserted, e.g. **הראשון**, j. Baba Mezia, 11 d.—P. 22, note 2, belongs to the previous example **מביעיא בעי ליה**. I think, though, that the dative **ליה** in this formula as well as in **מביעיא ליה**, b. Megilla, 15 b and often, is an ethical dative. Thus **מביעיא להו** signifies not exactly "it was asked by them," but "it was asked for them," or "it was to them a question," and **מביעיא ליה** "it would be requisite for him (i.e. for the

Biblical author or the expositor of the text) to know." We must similarly explain the dative with פשיטא, אסתפק, מספקא, מצטריןא ; cf. b. Sabbath, 4 b מבעיא לרב זירא . . . מילתא דפשיטא להו.—P. 27, on לסהרה see article אטו Ibid., l. 5 from below, for לסהרה read לסהרה, for otherwise the numerical equivalence of the letters is disturbed.—P. 37 an article ד' should be inserted (see the dictionaries).—P. 39, l. 2 (see also p. 213), the change of דהוא into והוא is not justified, cf. the proverb שבקיה לרוי'א דמנפשיה נפיל, which perhaps was not without influence on the genesis of the expression דהוא לקרא דהוא שבקיה לקרא דהוא דחיק ומוקים אנפשיה. Also, I should not translate דהוא דחיק by "for it presses," but "for it is limited" (cf. דחיקא להו מילתא, b. Taanith, 21 a, where the sense is indubitably passive).—P. 47 we miss an article חודה (this is also lacking in Part I), e.g. הכל מודין, j. Shebuoth, 37 c, כל עמא מודו, j. Baba Mezia, 8 c and often ; חודה with dative frequently, e.g. אודוי' ליה אודוי' לפלוג עליה אפלוני, b. Shebuoth, 38 b.—P. 50 an article הורה might be added, e.g. הורי ר' לעזר, j. Aboda Zara, 41 b, 10, הורייה, הוראה (see the dictionaries).—P. 53 there should be added the Piel הילך, j. Horayoth, 46 a (see below, pp. 103 and 106).—P. 58, an article השאה is missing. The meaning of this is to be gathered from the only passage in which it occurs (j. Aboda Zara, 41 c below) : היה לו להשיאו בחמש השאות שבתורה. It refers to the five passages of the Pentateuch in which it is uncertain whether a word stands in connexion with the preceding or succeeding text. חמשה דברים שאין להם הכרע (see Part I, p. 87). Levy (I. 496 b) punctuates and explains הַשִּׂיָא from הַשִּׂיָא, "to bring to another subject." But apart from the fact that the word must on that theory be read הַשִּׂיָא (הַשִּׂיָא) or הַשִּׂיָא, the explanation is very forced. I suggest the reading הַשִּׂיָא. It would then be derived from the hiphtil הַשִּׂיָא, and could signify "enticement" or "misleading" in the sense that in these five passages of the Pentateuch an enticement to error presents itself.—P. 65, חזור בך, j. Aboda Zara, 42 a might be also cited.—P. 67, cf. קולת וחומרת, j. Horayoth, 48 a, top. Ibid., an article חסל should be inserted.—P. 78. The punctuation of כביכול as כְּבִיכּוֹל seems to me impossible ; on the other hand כְּבִיכּוֹל is explicable as the participle יכול with כְּ, like בשונג and במזיד ; this again combined with the prefix כ. Thus כביכול is grammatically parallel to כְּבִיכּוֹל.—P. 82. Add article כה, see p. 155, l. 4, and j. Sanhedrin, 25 c כה עשה.—P. 126 an article נעל should be inserted (see article צריך, p. 183, l. 5 from below). Ibid., l. 17, read Horayoth, 48 a 14; and often.—P. 144 an article ספק is to be added, see below, p. 173, ll. 5 seq. ; we also have אסתפק, b. Rosh ha-shana, 14 b.—P. 146, to

article עבר might be added מרה דעוברה, j. Aboda Zara, 41 a, 23 in contrast to רשמועהתא (see article שמועה).—P. 147 an article עבר (see p. 240, top) might be cited.—P. 156. To the article פלג belongs the form תפלוגתא, j. Sabbath, 37 b, &c.—P. 157, article פנה, the form מִפְּנֵה (j. Horayoth, 45 d 2) is to be included.—P. 184 the form אצטרִיךְ is missing.—P. 185, add the form מצטרֶף (see article לאו).—P. 197, add the plural form קישואייה (j. Horayoth, 45 d).—P. 217, in article שלם, compare also j. Sanhedrin, 25 c נערה שלימה. In articles שמע and משמע cf. also j. Sabbath, 37 c הן שומע. In articles ממשמע לאו אתה שומע הן, j. Aboda Zara, 47 b, “the matter is in the balance.”—P. 237 an article תמים should be added, משנה תמימה, j. Sanhedrin, 26 a, in the sense of שלימה, b. Zebahim, 5 a. —P. 241, insert an article תפש, derived from j. Baba bathra, 24 d שם ראשון תופש.

The accuracy of the printing is remarkable. This is of no small moment in a philological work.

N. PORGES.